

**REMARKS**

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-9, 11-23, and 28-34 are pending in this application, and have been rejected. Claims 25-27 and 34 are cancelled herein.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9, 11-15, 25-27, and 34

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 4-6, 9, 11-15, 25-27, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) “as being unpatentable over Karmarkar (US 6,508,709) in view of Hedges et al. (US 4,467,424).” Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

***Claim 1*** is directed to an interactive gaming system that includes a data network in communication with a user computer, a gaming server in communication with the data network, and a slot machine in communication with the gaming server. The slot machine is located remotely from the user computer, and ***the user computer remotely controls the slot machine***. The system further includes a bandwidth and transmission detection device, wherein transmissions between the user computer and the slot machine are optimized using encryption and compression techniques. ***The slot machine has been previously approved by a gaming regulator for the locale in which the slot machine is located.***

Applicants’ application describes benefits of such an interactive gaming system:

The present invention provides a unique and novel means to allow a wagering device to be observed, controlled, and played from a remote location. With the invention, existing, previously approved wagering devices may be used. This effectively nullifies the need for ongoing software game development. It also creates a new secondary market for used wagering devices. The approval cycle for implementing the remote play version is shortened considerably because the wagering devices have

already undergone the regulatory approval cycle before being customized for remote play. Correspondingly, the costs of regulatory approval are reduced significantly.

Application at page 2.

Applicants respectfully submit that *neither Karmarkar nor Hedges disclose or suggest an interactive gaming system that includes a user computer that remotely controls a slot machine previously approved by a gaming regulator for the locale in which the slot machine is located*. Karmarkar describes a virtual casino gaming system that allows a remote player to bet for, or against, a “live player” while viewing either a live casino video signal or a pre-recorded casino video signal. *See* Karmarkar, column 2, lines 44-47. But the Karmarkar system does not allow user computer to remotely *control* a slot machine. And Karmarkar also expressly teaches away from *slot machine* gaming, which Karmarkar characterized as a less exciting type of game. For example, Karmarkar states:

[M]any players, particularly younger players below the age of forty, consider video slot gaming to be quite boring.

The present invention makes the playing of non-slot games into “no-brainers” like slot games, without also eliminating the player “excitement and appeal” that non-slot games generate, so that a player can participate without the stress and potential public shame arising from a player’s misjudgment and associated losses at a live gaming table. No other player can see what any particular player has lost, just like at a slot machine.

Karmarkar, column 5, lines 10-20.

Hedges also does not disclose a remote gaming system for slot machines; only roulette, craps, and keno. Therefore, neither Karmarkar nor Hedges, individually or in combination, describe the interactive gaming system of claim 1.

**Claims 2, 4-6, and 9** depend directly from claim 1, and thus contain all of the features recited in claim 1. Because independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references, dependent claims 2, 4-6, and 9 also are not obvious.

**Claim 11** is directed to an interactive gaming system that includes means for communicating between a remotely located computer and *a slot machine previously approved by a gaming regulator for the locale in which the slot machine is located*; means for *entering commands into the computer to operate and control the slot machine*; and means for detecting a bandwidth and transmission, wherein transmissions between the remotely located computer and the slot machine are optimized using encryption and compression techniques.

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Karmarkar nor Hedges, individually or in combination, describe the gaming system of claim 11. Applicants also respectfully submit that claim 11 is distinct from other claims (e.g., claim 1).

**Claim 12** is directed to a method for permitting a remotely located player to *control a slot machine previously approved by a gaming regulator for the locale in which the slot machine is located*. The method includes using a remotely located computer to communicate with the slot machine and entering commands into the computer to operate and control the slot machine. The method also includes detecting the player's connection bandwidth and transmission speed, wherein transmissions between the remotely located computer and the slot machine are optimized using encryption and compression techniques.

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Karmarkar nor Hedges, individually or in combination, describe the method of claim 12. Applicants also respectfully submit that claim 12 is distinct from other claims (e.g., claim 1).

*Claims 13-15* depend directly from claim 12, and thus contain all of the features recited in claim 12. Because independent claim 12 is not obvious in view of the cited references, dependent claims 13-15 also are not obvious.

*Claims 25-27 and 34* are cancelled herein.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-2, 4-6, 9, and 11-15 are not obvious in view of the Examiner's combination of Karmarkar and Hedges. Applicants thus respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 103(a) and allowance of the pending claims.

B     Claim 7

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) "as being unpatentable over Karmarkar (US 6,508,709) in view of Hedges et al. (US 4,467,424) and further in view of Watt (US 5,781,532)." Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

*Claim 7* depends directly from claim 1, and thus contains all of the features recited in claim 1. As stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 under § 103 and allowance of the pending claims.

C.     Claim 8

The Examiner has rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) "as being unpatentable over Karmarkar (US 6,508,709) in view of Hedges et al. (US 4,467,424) and further in view of Khosla (6,080,063)." Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

*Claim 8* depends directly from claim 1, and thus contains all of the features recited in claim 1. As stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 under § 103 and allowance of the pending claims.

D. Claims 3, 16-20, and 32-33

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 16-20, and 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) “as being unpatentable over Karmarkar (US 6,508,709) in view of Hedges et al. (US 4,467,424) and further in view of Lvov (6,117,011).” Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

*Claim 3* depends directly from claim 1, and thus contains all of the features recited in claim 1. As stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references.

*Claims 16-20 and 32-33* depend directly from claim 12, and thus contain all the features recited in claim 12. As stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3, 16-20, and 32-33 under §103 and allowance of the pending claims.

E. Claims 21-23

The Examiner has rejected claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) “as being unpatentable over Karmarkar in view of Hedges et al. and further in view of Graves (5,380,067).” Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

*Claims 21-23* depend directly or indirectly from claim 12, and thus include all of the features recited in claim 12. As stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21-23 under §103 and allowance of the pending claims.

F. Claims 28-31

The Examiner has rejected claims 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) “as being unpatentable over Karmarkar in view of Hedges et al. and further in view of Vuong (US 5,762,552).” Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

*Claims 28-31* depend directly or indirectly from claim 12, and thus include all of the features recited in claim 12. As stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 28-31 under § 103, and allowance of the pending claims.

III. Conclusion and Request for Reconsideration

Applicants request reconsideration of the present application in view of the aforementioned amendments and remarks. Although other features of the claims in the present application are also significant, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable for at least the aforementioned reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under § 103 be withdrawn, and that the pending claims be allowed.

In the event that a telephone conference would advance examination of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

IV. Authorization

Applicants submit herewith a check in the amount of \$1,020.00 and Petition for Extension of Time requesting a three-month extension of time. Applicants respectfully submit that no further extension of time or additional fee is due. In the event that the Commissioner determines that an additional fee is due for this paper, or that a petition for an extension of time is required, the undersigned hereby so petitions and authorizes the Commissioner to charge any fees required therefor to Milbank's deposit account no. 13-3250, order no. 30554-05700. A DUPLICATE COPY OF THIS PAGE IS ENCLOSED HEREWITH.

Respectfully submitted,  
Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP



---

Christopher J. Gaspar  
Reg. No. 41,030

August 21, 2007

Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP  
1 Chase Manhattan Plaza  
New York, NY 10005  
(212) 530-5000 / (212) 530-5219 (facsimile)